

**Minutes of the Regular Planning Board Meeting  
Monday, August 22, 2005 – 7:00 p.m.**

1. CONVENE: 7:03 p.m.
2. FLAG SALUTE: Vice President Cook
3. ROLL CALL: President Cunningham, Vice President Cook, Kohlstrand, Lynch, and Piziali.

Board members Mariani and McNamara were absent from roll call. Board member Mariani arrived during the Board discussion of Item 8-D.

Also present were Supervising Planner Cynthia Eliason, Deputy City Attorney Julie Harryman, Planner III Douglas Garrison, Planner III Allen Tai, Planner II Dennis Brighton.

4. MINUTES:
  - a. Minutes for the meeting of July 25, 2005 (**continued from the meeting of August 8, 2005.**).

M/S Piziali/Lynch to approve the minutes for the meeting of July 25, 2005, as presented.

AYES – 5 (Mariani, McNamara absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN - 0

- b. Minutes for the meeting of August 8, 2005.

President Cunningham advised that page 10, paragraph 8 should be changed to read, “He would like further discussions regarding the window signs, and believe that 25% window coverage contradicted the intentions of the Design *direction ordinance*.”

A quorum for a vote on the minutes was not present. They will be carried over to the next meeting.

5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION: None.
6. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None.
7. 2005-2006 ELECTION OF PLANNING BOARD OFFICERS

President Cunningham advised that it was customary for a full Board to be seated for an election, and that it should be continued until then.

8. CONSENT CALENDAR:

- 8.A. **PDA05-0003 Applicant: Joe Ernst/SRM Associates (DG).** The applicant proposes a Planned Development Amendment to amend the Harbor Bay Business Park landscaping and lot coverage provisions as established in Resolution 1203. This Amendment would affect Lots 1-6, 8 and 12 of Tentative Parcel Map 8574. These lots are fronting on or southerly of 1900 and 2000 North Loop Road. The proposed Planned Development Amendment would allow a five percent (5%) increase in building coverage for parcels larger than 5.5 acres. Currently, maximum allowed building coverage is thirty five percent (35%) for lots larger than 5.5 acres and forty percent (40%) on lots smaller than 5.5 acres. The maximum lot coverage allowed on lots smaller than 5.5 acres would not be affected. The proposed Planned Development Amendment would also decrease the minimum landscape coverage by five to ten percent (5 to 10%), depending on lot size. Currently, 30% landscaping coverage is required on lots smaller than 5.5 acres and 25% landscaping coverage is required for parcels larger than 5.5 acres. The proposed Planned Development Amendment would decrease the landscaping requirement to twenty percent (20%) for these lots regardless of size. The property is zoned C-M – PD (Commercial-Manufacturing – Planned Development.) **(Continued from the meeting of July 25, 2005.)**

M/S Piziali/Cook and unanimous to continue this item to September 26, 2005.

AYES – 5 (Mariani, McNamara absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN - 0

- 8-B. **FDP05-0002/DR05-0057 Applicant: Joe Ernst/SRM Associates (DG).** The applicant requests a Final Development Plan and Design Review for four (4) new flex warehouse, office and light manufacturing facilities ranging in size from 13,900 to 33,272 square feet on 6.41 acres adjacent to and southerly of 2000 North Loop Road (Parcels 8-12 on Tentative Parcel Map No. 8574). These facilities will be on one lot of approximately 11.53 acres until the final map is approved. The property is zoned C-M – PD (Commercial-Manufacturing – Planned Development.) **(Continued from the meeting of July 25, 2005.)**

M/S Piziali/Cook and unanimous to continue this item to September 26, 2005.

AYES – 5 (Mariani, McNamara absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN - 0

- 8.C. **Variance, V05-0006, and Major Design Review, DR05-0063 – Mary Claire & Robert Neumann – 2504 San Jose Avenue (DG).** The applicants request a Major Design Review approval for the construction of a 117-square foot detached accessory structure and an approximately 180-square foot deck at the rear of the single-family residence. A Variance approval is requested because the proposed detached structure would be built to within 6-inches from the westerly side and rear property lines, where minimum 5-foot setbacks are required because the structure would be located less than 75-feet from the front property line. The site is located within an R-4 (Neighborhood Residential) Zoning District.

M/S Piziali/Cook and unanimous to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-05-32 to approve a Major Design Review approval for the construction of a 117-square foot detached accessory structure and an approximately 180-square foot deck at the rear of the single-family residence. A Variance approval is requested because the proposed detached structure would be built to within 6-inches from the westerly side and rear property lines, where minimum 5-foot setbacks are required because the structure would be located less than 75-feet from the front property line.

AYES – 5 (Mariani, McNamara absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN - 0

8-D. Status Report and request for extension of time for construction allowed under Planned Development Amendment PDA02-0003 and Major Design Review DR02-0095, located at 2160 Otis Drive, South Shore Shopping Center (DG).

Vice President Cook advised that she had questions about this item.

Ms. Mariani arrived during the discussion of this item.

Vice President Cook noted that the Board had been asked for an extension of construction until 2010, which seemed to her to be a very long time. She understood that the construction would proceed with all due haste.

Ms. Eliason advised that the Walgreen's was in plan check. She noted that it was unusual to have a completion requirement, and that a vesting requirement was usually part of the conditions. Staff attempted to pick a date in the future so that all of Phase I could be completed, rather than bringing this item back to the Board every year.

Vice President Cook noted that the Board did not want construction to go on forever.

Mr. Lynch noted that he had some suggestions regarding this item, and remarked that it should be placed on the Regular Agenda.

M/S Piziali/Lynch and unanimous to remove Item 8-D from the Consent Calendar and place it on the Regular Agenda.

AYES – 6 (McNamara absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN - 0

Ms. Eliason summarized the staff report, and reviewed the history of this item. She noted that because of the hazmat cleanup and mitigation, it had taken longer than anticipated.

Mr. Lynch noted that the goal was to have less construction disturbance for the least amount of time, which led to the completion condition. Given the complexity of the construction, given with the staff resources required, he suggested that the Board look forward on a timeline, versus backwards. He noted that the vesting in the planning terminology was the using of the permit. He believed the applicant could demonstrate that, which would address the first hurdle. He noted that the second hurdle was the submittal of building plans, which must be reviewed by staff. When the permit is to be pulled, the Code requires the diligent exercise of the Building Permit to keep it active. He requested that the Board receive a bullet point list of every phase of this project, and that the significant milestones be attached to specific dates based on staff resources. He inquired whether the plan checking could be outsourced in order to keep the project on track.

Ms. Eliason advised that there was only one plan checker on staff, and that they were using outside resources as much as possible. She noted that Walgreen's submitted their plans in June, and she could check with the Building Official to confirm the length of

time that plan checking would take. She noted that it depended on whether there were any issues or problems.

Mr. Lynch suggested continuing the item so the Board could hear from the Department in terms of a realistic timeline.

Ms. Kohlstrand expressed concern about a jump in the extension from six months to five years without any background.

M/S Cook/Kohlstrand and unanimous to continue Item 8-D to the Planning Board meeting of September 12, 2006.

AYES – 6 (McNamara absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN - 0

9. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

- 9-A. **MDR05-0216, Regency Centers – 2599 Blanding Ave (AT).** The applicant requests sign program approval for the Bridgeside Shopping Center. The site is located within a C-2 PD, Central Business Planned Development District. **(Continued from the meeting of August 8, 2005.)**

Mr. Tai summarized the staff report and displayed the proposed signage designs on the overhead screen.

In response to an inquiry by Ms. Kohlstrand, Mr. Jerry Weiman, sign consultant, described the lighting and channel letter identification of the signage.

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Matthew Hoffman, 2800 Marina Drive, spoke in support of this application and noted that he recently moved to Alameda from Antioch. He hoped the project could be completed quickly so the sand dunes could be replaced.

Mr. Dave Needle, 2981 Northwood Drive, spoke in support of this application, and was happy that the signs were smaller. He had not heard any objections from the neighbors.

Ms. Barbara Price, PK Consultants, 1047 Tahiti, noted that she was speaking on behalf of the development team. She noted that representatives from Raley's, Regency Centers and Foothill Partners were also in attendance.

Mr. Hadi Monsef, PO Box 1355, spoke in support of this application and agreed with the staff report.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Mr. Piziali recalled that the Board did not want the view of the water from inside the stores to be blocked by window signs. He suggested creating a clear band of a certain height to allow the water view.

Mr. Lynch agreed with Mr. Piziali's suggestion, and noted that the clean lines should be maintained.

In response to Mr. Lynch's question, Mr. Piziali confirmed that he did not want to see additional signage by the merchants blocking the view. He noted that the developer's signage was fine.

President Cunningham cautioned against placing the signs so high that they could not be read without stepping back, or so low that they interfere with merchandising.

Ms. Kohlstrand requested a presentation to clarify the location of the signs. Mr. Tai noted that the four signs applied to Buildings B, C, D and F, and that individual standards were established for the market (Building A) and the gas station (Building E). He noted that page 6 in the Revised Sign Program contained the standards for the gasoline station signs.

M/S Kohlstrand/Mariani and unanimous to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-05-33 to approve the sign program for the Bridgeside Shopping Center.

AYES – 6 (McNamara absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN - 0



- 9-B. **PD03-0004; DR03-0108, Regency Centers - 2599 Blanding Avenue (AT).**  
Review of waterfront design, landscaping, and building elevation plans for compliance with project conditions of approval for the Bridgeside Shopping Center per Planning Board Resolution PB-04-64. The site is located within a C-2 PD, Central Business Planned Development District.

Mr. Tai summarized the staff report, and displayed the revised project site plans that addressed the Planning Board's previously stated concerns. Staff recommended approval of this item.

In response to an inquiry by Vice President Cook whether the transformers had been previously approved by the Planning Board, Mr. Tai replied that previous discussions did not involve transformers, nor the details of their appearance. They were shown as symbols on the plans, and the approximate locations were approved. Vice President Cook stated that she did not believe she approved any transformers before, and inquired why they could not be placed underground.

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Hadi Monsef, PO Box 1355, spoke in support of this application and noted that the staff report indicates the Board's requirements were met. He noted that he served on the Public Utilities Board for eight years, three years as president, and stated that it was very difficult to place transformers underground.

Mr. Matthew Hoffman, 2800 Marina Drive, spoke in support of this application. He noted that the transformer in this project would not bother him or some of the neighbors that he had spoken with. He looked forward to the completion of the project.

Ms. Barbara Price, PK Consultants, 1047 Tahiti, noted that she was speaking on behalf of the development team, and would be available to answer any questions.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Vice President Cook commended Mr. Tai for presenting such a detailed report. She noted that she had some concerns that made it difficult for her to support this item.

President Cunningham noted he was generally happy with the responses made by the applicant following Board discussions. He believed the seating area of the amphitheatre could be improved by introducing some earth berms.

Mr. Piziali was pleased to see a new handrail would be placed all the way across the front of the project. He liked the two steps in front of the Nob Hill stores, where the tables would be placed, which would separate the area from the walkway. He was generally pleased by the project.

Ms. Mariani noted she was happily surprised by the current plans, and complimented Raley's on the compromises they made. She stated that she found it difficult to notice transformers, and did not believe they would be burdensome in this project; she preferred them to a big box along the waterway. She believed they could be camouflaged by landscaping.

Ms. Kohlstrand advised she had no major concerns.

Vice President Cook noted that she had concerns regarding the changes that were not made, particularly the fact that the buildings were treated as having a back door instead of two front doors. The landscape plan did not change her perspective with respect to the orientation between the waterside of the buildings and the waterfront. She saw very few amenities, except for those required by BCDC. She saw very few benches and amenities, and would like people to be able to walk alongside the north side of the building to go shop to shop. She noted that would not be possible because of the grass breaking up the pavement between shopping entrances. She did not see any doors leading out to the waterside from Building B. She was pleased to see the coffee shop tenant would provide tables and chairs, and believed the landlord should also provide tables and chairs that would be permanently affixed outside for people to use for waterside picnics. She wanted to see more articulation and recessed door fronts along the waterside of the building to create a more interesting pedestrian environment. She was strongly opposed to the transformers, and did not believe they were inconspicuous. She expressed concern that the grading necessary for the amphitheatre was not included, although the Board had requested that condition. She was generally dissatisfied with this plan, and believed it did not adequately relate to the waterfront in a manner that would do justice to this unique site.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Piziali regarding the trees, Mr. Tai confirmed that since the staff report was written, the applicant has agreed to move the trees toward Blanding.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Lynch regarding Vice President Cook's comments regarding the grading, Mr. Tai responded that the original amphitheatre proposed did not have specific grading details that would indicate how it would be sloped. When staff received the construction documents, they realized that the amphitheatre area as shown on the plans could be improved upon so it would have more amphitheatre character and more lighting. Staff discovered that the grade difference between the front and the back end of the amphitheatre was only two feet, making it impossible to terrace the amphitheatre to create an actual staging area. Staff decided to place trees along the back and create a wedge-shaped public area that focused on the stage.

President Cunningham suggested that the developer bring in some dirt to make more of a grade.

Mr. Doug Weile, Foothill Partners, stated that it would not be a problem to bring additional fill material into the site. The issues had to do with the surrounding properties; there was a fence line on the property line separating the site from Union Pacific, and

they cannot get permission from Union Pacific to fill on their property. There is a fixed elevation along the boundary. The developers may make public health and safety improvements to Corps property, but not other improvements (under the moratorium of the Army Corps of Engineers). They cannot get permission from the Corps to lower the grade on the waterfront edge, and they cannot get permission from the railroad to raise the grade on the railroad edge. The project planner did not have any other workable design solutions other than those included in the plan.

Vice President Cook did not believe the space should be called an amphitheatre if it cannot function as such, and suggested that the space be may be used for chess and picnic tables.

Mr. Lynch noted that the value of this space may not be known until the project has been completed. He suggested that since the space would be landscaped, that a condition be placed that one year after the Final Certificate of Occupancy has been issued, the issue of the public space be revisited.

Ms. Eliason stated that staff could look at the landscape maintenance agreement, and could require that this part of the project be brought back to the Board as a condition of that agreement. Mr. Lynch agreed with that suggestion. Ms. Eliason stated that she was aware of several locations that had flat spaces in front of the amphitheatre; people would bring their own chairs if there was a concert or other performance.

Mr. Lynch would like to see some drawings to accompany the text document of the landscape maintenance agreement.

Ms. Eliason suggested that a condition be added, stating that prior to Final Occupancy of the last building, to have that space reviewed for its use.

Mr. Weile noted that the staff of the Bay Conservation and Development Commission now calls that space a “glade” instead of an amphitheatre because it was not sloped.

Mr. Lynch suggested that it be called “open public space” that is landscaped. He did not believe the specific activities needed to be itemized.

Vice President Cook advised that her vote against this project was primarily based on the interrelationship of the buildings with the waterfront.

Ms. Mariani noted that she was not excited about the transformers, and noted that they had not been specifically presented previously. She believed the present transformer placement was the lesser of two evils.

President Cunningham advised that he had spoken to a representative at Alameda Power & Telecom, and they did not recommend placing the transformers underground given its location. The transformer would require more maintenance when placed underground.

Vice President Cook noted that this site was a clean slate, and believed that the transformer placement could have been thought out more carefully. She strongly believed the transformer placement treated the waterfront side as a back door.

M/S Mariani/Piziali to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-05-34 to approve the waterfront design, landscaping, and building elevation plans for compliance with project conditions of approval for the Bridgeside Shopping Center per Planning Board Resolution PB-04-64.

AYES – 5 (McNamara absent); NOES – 1 (Cook); ABSTAIN - 0

- 9-C. **Presentation to the Planning Board concerning proposed 49,650 sq. ft. expansion of retail floor area, allowing the construction of a new 145,000 sq. ft. Target Department Store, construction of a new parking structure and improvements to the southeast corner of the South Shore Shopping Center under Planned Development Amendment PDA05-0004 (DG).** The purpose of this meeting is for discussion purposes only. No action to approve or deny PDA05-0004 will occur at this meeting.

Ms. Eliason advised there would be no staff report, and that the applicant would provide a presentation. No action would be taken at this time.

Mr. Randy Kite, Harsch Investment Properties, 523 South Shore Center West, reviewed the history of this project, and made a slide presentation to give the Board some perspective on the progress of the project, the current status and the future plans of the project.

Mr. Jan Taylor, project architect, Field Paoli, displayed the site plan and described the proposed phased improvements to the site. He noted that the use of stained wood would add a unique look to the property. He displayed current photographs of the site, and added that the use of unique and colorful signage, as well as awnings, would enliven the center. He noted the design changes would be a radical departure from the current appearance, and that the buildings would not appear to be cookie cutter buildings seen in other retail centers. He noted that the creation of the three beachfront restaurants would take advantage of the views across the Bay. He stated that one of the center owners, Jordan Snitzer, was very interested in implementing an art program that would exceed the City's mandates, such as a commemorative bronze statue of Alamedan Nell Schmidt, the first woman to swim across the Bay. He noted that a strong commercial western end that would activate the walkway between Mervyn's and the back of Albertson's would be desirable. He advised that Target was a tenant that paid attention to its surroundings, and created its architecture to suit. He noted that was the subject of a recent article in the *San Francisco Chronicle*. The firm believed that Target would be able to fit into the desired look and feel. He noted that the loading dock behind Safeway facing the apartment building to the south would be relocated to face the retail to the north. He displayed the proposed elevations of the Target store. Most of the building would be 37 feet high, with an additional six feet at the raised corner element. He stated that this Target would not look like the typical store, and would be tailored to this center.

Mr. Mike Corbitt noted that from a leasing point of view, Target would present an opportunity to build a unique store. He stated that Target was the number one tenant attractor in the retail marketplace.

Mr. Taylor noted that the majority of the parking would be underneath the store, and that the bottom floor of the store would be approximately ten feet above grade. He stated there would be a small additional surface-level parking lot adjacent to the store. They would investigate narrowing the street between the Willows and Target, providing a 20-

foot wide landscaping buffer. There could be a one-way-only entrance to the center to reduce traffic along the northern edge of the Willows.

In response to an inquiry by Vice President Cook whether a garden center would be included, Mr. Corbitt noted that he did not know, but would find out.

President Cunningham called for a five-minute break.

President Cunningham advised that more than five speaker slips had been received.

M/S Cook/Piziali and unanimous to limit the speakers' time to three minutes.

AYES – 6 (McNamara absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN - 0

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Hector Medina, 2101 Shoreline Drive, #258, spoke in opposition to this item. He noted that the new bus route generated more noise near his home, and he was concerned that this development would bring even more noise. He believed the design was beautiful, but that it would bring more traffic congestion, crime and noise to the neighborhood.

Mr. Tim Erway, President, Willows Homeowners Association, 2101 Shoreline Drive, spoke in opposition to this item. He believed the design and plans through Phase 7 were attractive, and he was pleased with them. He expressed concern that there would be less control over the site after the developer sells the land to Target. He was very concerned that the underground parking would attract crime and require more security. He agreed with Mr. Medina's concerns about the negative impact on the neighborhood following the bus route change. He wished to address traffic congestion and noise impacts.

Mr. Jon Spangler noted that he was speaking as a private citizen, and inquired whether access to all of the stores would be as convenient, or more convenient, for transit patrons and bicyclists as it will be for automobile drivers. He inquired whether Harsch would be willing to include mitigations such as shuttles running between the bridges, across the Island and from the tubes to South Shore up Doolittle. He suggested that the developer fund electric shuttles so that the noise to the adjacent residents would be reduced. He noted that AC Transit had discussed that option, and that it was in the Transit Master Plan for the City. He noted that equivalent access would be necessary, and those mitigations cannot be accomplished on a one-way street. He inquired about the impact Target would have on Mervyn's, and what would happen to that space once its lease is over and moves out. He believed the City was not doing enough to have effective and intelligent transit and transportation on the Island.

Mr. Blake Brydon, 1033 Camino Del Valle, spoke in support of this application. He believed the design would enhance South Shore, and that the addition of Target would be a benefit to the community. He believed that it would add diversity in shopping and retail that the Island did not have at this time.

Ms. Susan Pieper, 2101 Shoreline Drive #299, spoke in opposition to this item. She expressed concern about delivery trucks. She stated that all large, modern retailers used delivery of goods sold, which would increase the volume and impact of truck traffic, as well as noise and air pollution. She expressed concern about seismic safety of the underground parking structure, and believed that a building built on landfill in a major earthquake would be a hazard.

Ms. Valerie Ruma, 1610 Willow Street, spoke in opposition to this item, and expressed concern about traffic congestion and impacts from off-Island traffic.

Ms. Vivian Leigh Forde, 2101 Shoreline Drive #148, spoke in opposition to this item. She noted that she was generally happy with the progress at South Shore and the amenities being realized. She was strongly opposed to a 145,000 square foot edifice. She noted that this use would lead to more construction and pile-driving to support the structure, and that the lights and traffic noise would have a negative impact on the neighbors.

Ms. Joan DiStefano, 2101 Shoreline Drive #145, spoke in opposition to this item. She believed narrowing the space between the Willows and the shopping center would create more traffic jams. She noted that three residents of the Willows had been hit by cars in the last year in that area. She estimated a community of 70,000 people would not support this kind of retail use, and that 200,000 people would support it; the store would rely on people driving to Alameda via the tubes and the bridges, leading to gridlock. She was concerned that the independent merchants in town would be negatively impacted, and that sense of community would be eroded.

Ms. Dorothy Reid, 2101 Shoreline Drive, #276, spoke in opposition to this item and noted that she represented over 300 citizens who had written letters or signed petitions against this Target store. She noted that the Target profiled in the newspaper article was located in a mall, not in a smaller shopping center with limited access. She was concerned about the height, width and proximity of this building to the nearby homes. She believed there should be a full Environmental Impact Review performed on this site, and that this project would affect the health, safety and welfare of the residents in the area. She did not agree that this project met with the terms of the agreement, which stated that the buildings in the center should be low profile. She added that this store would need intensive outside services. She believed there should be an economic impact review as well. She did ~~not~~ believe this project should disrupt the lives of the area homeowners. *She asked why the public notice to this request only stated it was for an additional 49,650 square feet, and asked when an additional 90,000 square feet for this building was approved. The current Safeway is only 34,000 square feet, so the additional square footage is actually 111,000 square feet. She presented pictures that showed the Safeway's*

*building's height, which she believed is misrepresented in the architectural drawings presented by the applicant.*

Mr. Don Patterson, 1256 Sherman Street, spoke in opposition to this item, and thanked Mr. Garrison for meeting with him. He believed South Shore should submit a separate, detailed landscape and signage plan, based on the developer not complying with Trader Joe's landscape plan. He added that Trader Joe's has been open 35 months. He inquired how an Occupancy Permit can be issued without signoffs. He believed Alameda deserved better landscaping and signage than what was approved 40 years ago. He believed there should be five to eight feet of landscaping provided on each of the building walls, especially parking structures and Walgreen's. He believed the Master Plan, landscaping and signage plans should be submitted and approved before any additional permits are issued, and Trader Joe's landscaping should be completed.

Mr. Keith Wells was called to speak, but was not in attendance.

Ms. Ani Dimusheva, 2911 Calhoun Street, spoke in opposition to this item. She noted that the drawings were shown out of context, and that the convalescent homes or Willow Street were not shown. She believed the Target store was too tall, and that it would be too massive; its proximity overwhelmed the Mervyn's building. She was concerned that when Mervyn's closed, it would be replaced with an even larger building. She would like to see its replacement moved back and built smaller. She was concerned about traffic congestion. She believed smaller stores would serve Alameda better.

Ms. Alice Cleveland, 2101 Shoreline Drive #484, spoke in opposition to this item. She was concerned that the placement of this big box store would negatively impact her quality of life. She noted that the large tractor-trailers trucks currently drove past her home while servicing Safeway, and that they were noisy and dirty. She was very concerned about the potential truck traffic if Target were to open, and the traffic congestion surrounding the center. She saw Alameda as an upscale community, and did not see why it would want a Target store; she suggested that it be placed near the freeway or on Alameda Point.

Ms. Kris Murray, 1738 Alameda Avenue, spoke in support of this application, and added that, as a business owner herself, that public comment regarding businesses was generally from the opponents. She noted that she had spoken with more than 100 people in the past 48 hours who supported the idea of a Target store in Alameda. She acknowledged that Alameda was an upscale community, and that she had disposable income that she would like to spend in Alameda. However, she found that she often shopped off the Island to visit a Target store specifically. She believed a Target store would provide a shopping experience that's appropriate for the community's diversity, and that there were many residents who do need a discount marketer. She would like to spend her tax dollars in the community.

Ms. Jan Young, 2101 Shoreline Drive, noted that she was pleased with the progress at South Shore, and that it was beautiful. She did not like the idea of a Target in her



backyard. She liked the idea of the small storefronts. She lived across from the Safeway loading dock, and was concerned about the current and future noise and air pollution. She was concerned about her property value, and agreed that Alameda did not need a big box store.

Mr. Jon Brooks, 2101 Shoreline Drive #230, spoke in opposition to this item. He had not heard anything from City staff about the requirement for an EIR in this circumstance, and believed there would be a cumulative effect from the traffic and air quality. He did not want Alameda to become homogeneous, and would rather see a mixed use retail store, perhaps with lofts upstairs from smaller boutiques.

Mr. Brian McDonald noted that he lived at the Willows, and that he agreed with his neighbors regarding traffic, noise and pollution. He did not like the prospect of having a Target in his back yard, and found the overall size and footprint of the store to be excessive. He believed the developer employed bait-and-switch tactics in seeking approval for this store. He was concerned that the traffic impacts would put the entire East End into gridlock.

Mr. Kevin Frederick spoke in opposition to this item, and noted that this store was gigantic and would interrupt the flow of traffic. He believed the Target store would create urban sprawl, which he was strongly opposed to. He hoped the Board would listen to the majority in this matter.

Ms. Aulette Floris noted that she was a business owner, but was opposed to a big box store. She was very concerned about traffic congestion and noise. She noted this was so close to a residential area, and was concerned about a potential increase in crime and decrease in the quality of life.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Ms. Mariani would like to see the approval for the 90,000 square feet with the conditions. Ms. Eliason noted that staff would provide a copy. Ms. Kolhstrand concurred with the request.

Ms. Eliason advised that the last Planned Development Amendment performed in 2003 was adopted on a Mitigated Negative Declaration. Staff would provide a copy of that document to the Board. No environmental review had been circulated for this project yet; a new environmental review would be done for this project, updating the traffic numbers and other areas of concern.

Vice President Cook would like to look at this project more closely, especially in view of the City's work in retail strategy and increasing its tax base. She realized that there was considerable retail leakage off the Island that could be captured for the benefit of the schools, police and fire departments. She would like to have a better understanding of the typical Target patron. She believed that many residents did want more retail opportunities, and acknowledged that environmental review was a huge concern. One of

her continuing concerns about the Center was the lack of pedestrian connections, as well as bicycle access. She believed that the pedestrian and bicycle environments in the center must change. She was concerned about the cumulative impacts of the piecemeal nature of the center. She believed a parking structure would not only break up the expanse of pavement in front of Mervyn's, and would also be more attractive if landscaped properly.

Mr. Piziali noted that he would like to see this item come back before the Board in the form of a workshop before any action is taken. He was concerned about the large amount of square footage, and while he did not want retail leakage going off the Island, he did not want floods of people coming from off-Island to shop, either.

Mr. Lynch noted that he agreed with the comments made by the other Board members. He would be interested in examining the environmental documents. He was interested to hear comments about a possible mixed use at the center. He would like to see a larger view of the City operation as a whole, from an economic development perspective, as well as other perspectives. He noted this was not a stand alone issue, and that it should be integrated into other commissions.

Ms. Kohlstrand noted that she agreed with Vice President Cook's comments, and believed that scale was an important consideration. She noted that the safety of sidewalks and bicycle paths near Safeway were paramount.

President Cunningham noted that some parts of the policy document fit with the Target store, and other parts are in opposition to what the community wants. The report acknowledged that the leakage data would present opportunities to bring retail solutions into the community. It also went on to say that it was up to the community and the private sector to decide what kind of retail should be included, as well as what type of retail did not fit the community character. He noted that Target did respond to the community needs, and are serious about providing a store that would fit in with the community; he applauded those efforts. He noted that other Target stores have demonstrated the company's willingness to buy into sustainability. He was very interested in possible traffic mitigations. He would like further insight into the impact that this store would have on the existing tenants in the community, particularly the smaller stores.

Vice President Cook noted that she spoke with a woman who managed a small retail shop, who did not object to the Target store. The manager stated that she would shift the items in her inventory to carry what Target did not.

President Cunningham recalled that Ms. Mariani requested a definition of a big box store, and agreed with Mr. Piziali's suggestion of holding a workshop. He recommended giving the matter more time before making a decision.

Ms. Mariani inquired how the square footage increased from 90,000 to 145,000 square feet. She expressed concern about the direction the City is taking, given the approval of the Cineplex and the consideration of this Target store. She did not believe the addition of

this store would be fair to the residents of the Willows, as well as the nursing home facilities.

Ms. Kohlstrand would like the developer to inform the Board about the relationship between Mervyn's and Target.

No action was taken.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS: None.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATION:

- a. Oral Status Report regarding the Northern Waterfront Plan (Vice-President Cook).

Vice President Cook advised there had been no further meetings.

- b. Oral Status Report regarding the Golf Course Committee (Board Member Piziali).

Mr. Piziali advised there was nothing new to report.

- c. Oral Status Report regarding the Oakland/Chinatown Advisory Committee (Board member Mariani).

Ms. Mariani advised that she did not have any further information. She noted that she would speak with President Cunningham and the City Council because she was having some trouble making all of the meetings; there is no backup replacement at this time. She noted that Ms. McNamara had been the backup, and is no longer; in addition, the WABA representative is no longer on the Committee.

- d. Oral Status Report regarding the Transportation subcommittee (Board member Kohlstrand).

Ms. Kohlstrand advised that she was not in attendance at the meeting due to her vacation. She noted that the meeting date was set with very short notice.

12. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Eliason advised that there will be a Transportation Master Plan meeting of the Task Force on Wednesday, August 24, 2005, at 7:30 p.m. The meeting would address streets and circulation plans.

13. ADJOURNMENT: 10:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Benoit, Acting Secretary  
Planning & Building Department

These minutes were approved at the September 12, 2005, Planning Board meeting. This meeting was audio and video taped.